1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

WILLIAM A. RICHARDSON,)	
P	Plaintiff,	Case No. 2:11-cv-02078-GMN-PAL
VS.		<u>ORDER</u>
OPPENHEIMER HOLDINGS, INC., 6	et al.,	
Γ	Defendants.	

Before the court is the parties' Stipulation and Proposed Order to Extend Discovery and Other Deadlines (Dkt. #30). The Complaint (Dkt. #1) in this case was filed December 22, 2011. Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. #18) March 26, 2012. On May 17, 2012, the court entered a Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (Dkt. #29) when the parties had not submitted one as required by LR 26-1. In the current stipulation, the parties advise the court that this is an action brought pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act ("PSLRA"). As such, it is subject to a stay pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(3)(B) during the pendency of a motion to dismiss. The current stipulation requests that an extension of the existing discovery plan and scheduling order deadlines entered by the court. As the parties do not intend to conduct discovery and agree the case should be stayed pending decision of the motion to dismiss, the court will deny the request, but vacate the original scheduling order, and require the parties to submit a proposed discovery plan and scheduling order within 14 days of decision of the pending motion to dismiss as to any claims which survive.

IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1. The parties' Stipulation (Dkt. #30) is **NOT APPROVED** and is **DENIED**.
- 2. The court's Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (Dkt. #29) is **VACATED** and discovery is **STAYED** during the pendency of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

Case 2:11-cv-02078-GMN-PAL Document 31 Filed 05/25/12 Page 2 of 2

Counsel shall meet and confer and submit a proposed discovery plan and scheduling 3. order within 14 days of decision of the pending motion to dismiss with respect to any claims that survive. Dated this 24th day of May, 2012. United States Magistrate Judge